

REMARKS

Applicant respectfully requests the reconsideration of this application and the consideration of the following remarks.

Applicant thanks the examiner for pointing out that claims 9, 30, 51 and 72 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and intervening claims.

Claims 1, 22-39, 43, 64, 86, 89, 91, 93, 96 and 100 are currently amended.

Applicant respectfully submits that pending claims are patentable over the prior art.

The Office Action rejected claims 1-8, 10-18, 22-29, 31-39, 43-50, 52-60, 64-71 and 73-107 as being anticipated by the Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA"). Applicant respectfully disagrees. For example, claim 1 recites the following limitations.

1. **"the indicator** being separate from an extension"
2. **"the indicator** being user selectable for a single file in the plurality of files in said digital processing system without effecting other files in the plurality of files"
3. **"the indicator** to indicate how to display an extension of the file"

It is clear that "being separate from an extension", "being user selectable for a single file in the plurality of files in said digital processing system without effecting other files in the plurality of files", and "to indicate how to display an extension of the file" are all about the same limitation "the indicator". Applicant respectfully submits that APA does not have such an indicator as recited in the claim.

The Office Action failed to point out what in APA corresponds to the limitation "an indicator" recited in "associating a file with an indicator ..." of the claim. The Office Action

failed to find a single item in APA such that the single item satisfies all of the limitations specified for the limitation "the indicator". Considering one item as "the indicator" in reading one of the limitations and another different item as "the indicator" in reading another one of the limitations is clearly improper for the rejection.

Thus, since the Office Action failed to find an item in APA that correspond to the limitation "an indicator", the rejection is improper. The withdrawal of the rejection for claims 1-8, 10-18, 22-29, 31-39, 43-50, 52-60, 64-71 and 73-85 is respectfully requested.

The Office Action failed to find what in APA corresponds to "a first indicator" and what in APA corresponds to "a second indicator" for the rejection of claim 86. Thus, the withdrawal of the rejection for claim 86-88 is respectfully requested.

For the rejection of claims 89-92, the Office Action failed to find what in APA corresponds to "an indicator" that has the following limitations.

1. *"the indicator* being separate from an extension"
2. *"the indicator* being user selectable for a subset of files in the plurality of files which have the same extension in said digital processing system"
3. *"the indicator* to indicate how to display an extension of the file"

Thus, the withdrawal of the rejection for claim 89-92 is respectfully requested.

For the rejection of claims 93-98, the Office Action failed to find what in APA corresponds to "an indicator" the has the following limitations.

1. *"the indicator* being separate from an extension"
2. *"the indicator* being user selectable for a subset of a plurality of files in the digital processing system"
3. *"the indicator* to indicate that first extensions of said subset of files are displayed in a user interface in a first style which is different from a

second style used to display at least a second file in said plurality of files, wherein said second file is not in said subset and has a second extension which is the same as at least one of said first extensions"

Thus, the withdrawal of the rejection for claim 93-98 is respectfully requested.


In rejecting claims 99-107, the Office Action failed to identify what in page 1, lines 10-12, corresponds to "the indicator". Claim 99, for example, recites "the indicator is not a part of a name of the file". It is improper to point to something that "is not a part of a name of the file" for the rejection when "the something" being relied upon has nothing to do with "the indicator" recited in the base claims. Thus, the withdrawal of the rejection for claim 99-107 is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages or credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 02-2666. Furthermore, if an extension is required, Applicant hereby requests such extension.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Dated: 10/12, 2005



James C. Scheller, Jr.
Reg. No. 31,195

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300